

column 2, lines 60-63 of Henshaw et al., Figure 1 is so described:

"FIG. 1 shows an enlarged representation of a section of an integrated metal-composite chamber and particularly the distribution of filaments within the metal;".
(Emphasis added.)

Similarly, column 3, lines 6-12 makes it clear that Figure 1 is only depicting the cavity portion of the body:

"FIG. 1 depicts a section of an integrated metal-composite structure **10** from a metal sleeve **11** containing a composite **15** have (sic, having) a plurality of high strength-high modulus filaments **12** uniformly distributed throughout the composite **15** and the sleeve passage **16**." (Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, Figure 1 of Henshaw et al. merely shows the cavity itself, and does not disclose a cavity having an inner surface that is a distance from the mass center of the blank and is arranged concentrically around the mass center (of the blank) as required by the instant claims.

Applicants note that the foregoing argument applies as well to claim 31. Specifically, the Examiner rejects claim 31 for the reason that Figure 1 of Henshaw et al. allegedly shows a bending resistant body shaped like a spindle. However, as detailed above, Figure 1 of Henshaw et al. is not the bending resistant body, but rather is only the cavity portion of the body. Nowhere do Henshaw et al. disclose or suggest the spindle recited in claim 31.

The Examiner rejects claims 16 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Henshaw et al. The Examiner considers it merely an obvious matter of design choice to shrink the cavity to the fiber composite body.

Claims 16 and 24 are believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence, for the reasons recited above.

The Examiner rejects claims 19 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over

Henshaw et al. in view of Tazaki et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,169,186. The Examiner admits that Henshaw et al. do not disclose a number of longitudinal cavities distributed with an equal pitch symmetrically around the mass center seen in a section at right angles to its longitudinal axis, and cites Tazaki et al. as disclosing this feature.


Claims 19 and 26 are believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence for the reasons articulated above.

The Examiner rejects claims 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Henshaw et al. in view of Mahoney et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,207,848. The Examiner admits that Henshaw et al. do not disclose a tubular composite body having a central bore devoid of fibers, and cites Mahoney et al. as disclosing this feature.

Claims 29 and 30 are believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence, for the reasons articulated above.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing.

Respectfully submitted,


Kevin S. Lemack
Reg. No. 32,579
TEL: (508) 898-1818